

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,652	12/30/2003	Geon-Ook Park	20067/OPP031475US	6900
34431 7590 03/06/2006			EXAMINER	
HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC			TOBERGTE, NICHOLAS J	
20 N. WACKE SUITE 4220	ER DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, II	L 60606		2823	

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<del>_</del>			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/748,652	PARK, GEON-OOK			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Nicholas J. Tobergte	2823			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Fe	ebruary 2006.				
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.				
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-9 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4,5,7 and 8</u> is/are allowed.						
-	Claim(s) <u>1-3,9</u> is/are rejected.					
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	rr.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) $\square$ objected to by the $\square$	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage			
	application from the International Bureau	* **				
* (	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.			
Attachmen			(DTO 442)			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D				
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2823

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the examiners references for rejecting claim 1 "neither disclose nor suggest implanting oxygen ions and forming an oxide in the region of the trench to be formed prior to forming the trench".

In response, the examiner would like to bring to attention **Col 3 lines 40-49** in Kim. It states forming a field oxide by implanting oxygen ions into a field region of a surface of a semiconductor. In this embodiment, there is no mention of a trench having been formed prior to this. In Col 3 lines 33-39 Kim specifically states that the trench is formed first. For this reason, the examiner takes the position that Kim is teaching that the oxide layer can be formed before or after the trench has been made.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (US 6,008,526) and further in view of Kao et al (US 20030170964 A1).

Art Unit: 2823

Pertaining to claims 1 and 2, <u>Kim</u> teaches a method for forming a trench in a semiconductor device comprising:

forming a pad oxide film 2 and a silicon nitride film 4 on a semiconductor substrate 1;

selectively etching the silicon nitride film 4 and the pad oxide film 2 on a region to be formed with a trench Col 2 lines 28-31;

implanting oxygen ions into the semiconductor substrate in the region to be formed with the trench Col 3 lines 50-56;

forming an oxide in the semiconductor substrate by reacting the oxygen ions with the semiconductor substrate through a thermal diffusion of the oxygen ions **Col 3 lines** 42-48:

forming the trench by etching the semiconductor substrate and the oxide on the region to be formed with the trench Col 2 lines 26-31 and Fig 2B;

forming a liner oxide film 8 on an inner wall of the trench using a thermal diffusion process Col 2 lines 34-35; and

forming an insulation film 10 on the liner oxide film such that the trench is filled Col 2 lines 35-37.

wherein an edge at which a side and a bottom of the trench intersect has a curved surface. See Fig 2B.

<u>Kim</u> fails to teach the method of claim 1 wherein the mask used in the etch is the silicon nitride film.

Art Unit: 2823

<u>Kim</u> fails to teach the method of claim 2 wherein the substrate is comprised of a silicon substrate.

Page 4

<u>Kao</u> teaches the use of a silicon nitride mask when etching a trench in an ion implanted semiconductor substrate. **[0027-0033]**. Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teachings of <u>Kao</u> to the process of <u>Kim</u>. The motivation for doing this would be to decrease the number of photoresist masking layers as well as utilize a mask that is impermeable to implanted ions such as a silicon nitride mask **[0033]**.

<u>Kao</u> teaches the use of a silicon substrate [0025]. <u>Kao</u> discloses that silicon is a typical semiconductor substrate material, and therefor would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to choose such a well known and obvious material in the art.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Kim</u> (US 6,008,526) and further in view of <u>Kao et al</u> (US 20030170964 A1).

Kim teaches the method of claim 2, wherein, in selectively etching the oxidation blocking layer 34 and the pad oxide film 32, a first photosensitive film pattern 36 for exposing the oxidation blocking layer on the region to be formed with the trench is formed by applying, exposing, and developing a photosensitive film on the oxidation blocking layer, and then the oxidation blocking layer and the pad oxide film exposed are selectively etched using the first photosensitive film pattern as a mask See Fig 4A.

Application/Control Number: 10/748,652 Page 5

Art Unit: 2823

Kim fails to explicitly point out that silicon nitride is an oxidation blocking layer.

Kao teaches that silicon nitride is used as an oxidation blocking layer [0033].

Therefor it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to expose the trench using a photosensitive film on the oxidation blocking layer (silicon nitride film) and the pad oxide layer, the motivation being that this is a conventional photolithography process known in the art.

Pertaining to claim 9, Kim in view of Kao teaches the method of claim 1, however they fail to particularly point out that etching the substrate and the oxide on the region to be formed with the trench at different rates. The examiner would like to point out however, that the applicant does not disclose in paragraph [0017] the specific etch parameters. Because of this, the examiner would like to state that for the most part, silicon and silicon oxide will etch at different rates depending specifically upon the etchant mixture. See Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era: Volume 1 Process Technology 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition written by Wolf and Tauber, page 675. Figures 14-15 and 14-16 show different dry etching techniques with Si and SiO2. Notice that the rates are varying constantly with the change in the gas mixture and they only intersect at one point. Because the applicant is not specific enough in the disclosure, this constitutes as differing etch rates, and such difference is inherent.

Art Unit: 2823

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4,5,7, and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The reason for allowance is that it is not obvious, based on the prior art, to form a second photosensitive film pattern before ion implantation that is narrower then the first photosensitive film pattern.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas J. Tobergte whose telephone number is 571-272-6006. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thur 7am - 5:30pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/748,652 Page 7

Art Unit: 2823

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NJT

W. DAVID COLEMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER